DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 635 FL 021 124

AUTHOR Mahone, Alicia
TITLE Bilingual Education Instructional and Training Materials. Field Test Results and Final Phase II Report.
INSTITUTION Gray (Naomi) Associates, Inc., San Francisco, CA.; Human Resources Corp., San Francisco, CA.; San Francisco Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 8 Feb 85
CONTRACT 300-82-0322
NOTE 47p.; For related documents, see FL 021 117-123.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; Affective Objectives; *Bilingual Instructional Materials; Bilingualism; Classroom Techniques; Course Organization; Curriculum Design; English (Second Language); Ethnicity; Immigrants; *Inservice Teacher Education; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Language Maintenance; Language Skills; *Limited English Speaking; *Material Development; Middle Schools; Migration Patterns; Program Design; Second Language Instruction; Skill Development; *Spanish Speaking; State History; *Urban Schools; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The report describes a federally funded project for the development of an innovative approach to bilingual curriculum and instruction and inservice teacher training. A needs assessment and research process resulted in development and field testing of a set of bilingual Spanish-English instructional materials for limited-English-speaking urban middle school students and related materials for teacher training and support. The materials included a bilingual textbook on the history and geography of California, a series of student worksheets, and a teacher's guide to classroom activities coordinated with the textbook. The teacher training component consisted of a series of workshops addressing issues in bilingual education and the use of the materials developed. The final project report details the process by which these tasks were completed, in two phases, and the field testing of the instructional materials with 204 students in one school district. Practical recommendations are made for use of the program and materials in other settings. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NGA

naomi gray associates, inc.

1726 fillmore st. • san francisco 94115 • (415) 922-4633

ED356635

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION
AND MINORITY LANGUAGE AFFAIRS

Contract No. 300 82 0322

BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL AND TRAINING MATERIALS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Deliverable Item: 55 Final Phase II Report

Submitted: February 8, 1985

By: Alicia Mahone, Project Director

FL 021 124

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NGA

naomi gray associates, inc.

1726 fillmore st. • san francisco 94115 • (415) 922-4633

Contract # 300 82 0322

TO: U.S. Department of Education
AMPS/BEOA Branch
Room 3, 7th and "D" Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.D. 20202

ATTN: Jean Milazzo

FROM: Alicia Mahone, Project Director

DATE: February 8, 1985

SUBJECT: Final Phase II Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
INTRODUCTION	1
PHASE I REPORT	2
PHASE II REPORT	6
EVALUATION REPORT	9
RECOMMENDATIONS	34

INTRODUCTION

The growth of Hispanic and Indochinese population in the United States represents a spectacular rate of increase. The number of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in our schools is increasing at the same time that the government agencies are experiencing tremendous budget cuts and, at the same time, our society is taking quantum leaps into a new technological era. Previous efforts to create sound basis for educational intervention on behalf of LEP students have been commendable yet disjointed and uncoordinated. Similarly, efforts to provide support to school districts and school district personnel have also been disjointed, misdirected and uncoordinated.

Clearly, what was needed was a new direction, a new generation of effort, which draw upon the considerable knowledge we now possess on the problems of educational reform, the impediments of institutional change, and the necessary process of parent/community involvement and shared decision making.

With this in mind, Naomi Gray Associates in collaboration with San Francisco Unified School District, subcontracting to U. S. Human Resources Corporation joined the Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Language Minority Affairs in designing, and implementing an "inclusionary" process approach to provide support services to local education agencies. We say "join" because it was truly a collaborative effort on the part of the individuals involved in sharing the experience of designing and implementing a new concept in bilingual curriculum/instruction and training materials development.

During Phase I of our 30-month bilingual materials development project began in August of 1982, the first major task was to review literature about curriculum development and instructional materials which might be available in Spanish and English for seventh grade social studies classes.

Basically, the literature review revealed that very few materials were available for this grade level, subject area and language group and that those which were available could not be readily used or adapted for local use because they did not respond well to the local needs in terms of specific content, cultural nuances, or idiomatic use of the first language.

The next major step/task in the project was to recruit the technical team members and finalize our review panel members. The technical team members were recruited from among the five Spanish bilingual schools within the San Francisco Unified School District and from the bilingual/ESL curriculum development section and also an administrator from the bilingual education department, so that among the six members of the technical team there existed a variety of educational experiences and perspectives. The training sessions held for the technical team focused on the development of the process/approach model for bilingual curriculum and instructional materials development. At this same time a review panel of educational specialists with expertise in bilingual education and/or bilingual curriculum and instructional materials development was established, which included a member of the bilingual educational department of a local university, the head of a local TESOL chapter, and a member of a local educational research organization which has extensive experience and expertise in bilingual education.

After both teams were established then began the process/approach model. The project staff held extensive and intensive training sessions for the technical team members. The team adjusted the process/approach we originally proposed, a new and more flexible design was adapted to fit different situations depending on the specific needs and perspectives of the technical team.

One of the issues which emerged during these discussions was the fact that the curriculum developer from the S.F.U.S.D. bilingual education department curriculum development office had developed a bilingual unit on the history of California which could be adapted using our process/approach. That is, The Story of California had been translated into Spanish and English, as well as six other languages, but still needed revisions and was lacking curriculum materials to go with it such as a teacher's guide and student worksheets. The technical team agreed that these materials would be particularly responsive to local needs.

The next step in the process/approach model was to actually develop the needed bilingual curriculum and instructional materials. The Technical Team commenced this step in Phase I of the project in February, 1983. During this time we held regular technical team meetings, usually one and often two per week in order to discuss the key issues involved in curriculum development. The goals and objectives for cognitive, language, and affective development were discussed at great length, since the materials had to be properly designed in terms of these dimensions.

In terms of cognitive development, it was decided that the concepts could be higher than the language level because many students had higher cognitive

development than language development, especially in Spanish. Also, the technical team decided that the curriculum and instructional materials to be developed should address the affective development of the students, since students in seventh grade are in a state of rapid and often confusing transition in adolescent development and are often having difficulty adjusting to a new culture. Thus, the ideas in the text and the worksheets and the teachers' guide should relate as much as possible to the students' native culture.

During the spring, summer, and fall, 1983, the project worked with the Technical Team in developing the bilingual curriculum and instructional materials using the process/approach. During this same time we also worked developing the evaluation design and field test instrument to be used during the field test, which would be conducted during the spring semester of the 1983-84 school year. This evaluation design included the design and the field test instruments, which included feedback from the teachers and students about the curriculum and instructional materials as well as a classroom observation sheet for classroom observations by the technical team in order to secure first hand feedback from field test teachers and to observe the actual use of the curriculum and instructional materials in the classroom. It was also important in the evaluation design to measure student language proficiency in Spanish and English, so the field test instrument included the Oral Language Proficiency Rating Scale (OPRS). The field test instrument also included measures of students' academic performance utilizing the materials, based on teacher ratings of student performance.

The preparations for the field test were also made by contacting school districts and teachers in order to obtain participation for the field test.

Finally, six or possibly seven classes in the San Francisco Unified School District had agreed to participate in the field test of the bilingual curriculum and instructional materials. These classes are bilingual Spanish-English seventh grade social studies classes. The field test will include about 210 - 250 students in these classes in Spanish and English.

On February 10, 1984 a training workshop was conducted for field test teachers at Roosevelt Junior High School in Oakland, although field test teachers from S.F.U.S.D. were also workshop participants. At this workshop, one of the members of the technical team who was a curriculum developer and developed The Story of California trained the field test teachers in the contents of The Story of California and how to use it during the field test. Another member of the technical team trained the workshop participants in classroom management. Also, the evaluator who had developed the evaluation design trained the teachers in how to use the field test instruments and how the evaluation data would be collected.

During this time we also wrote three manuals -- (1) a How To Workbook, (2) a Training Manual, and (3) a Resource Manual for use by bilingual teachers, curriculum developers, district administrators, school principals, parents, and others who need to develop bilingual curriculum and instructional materials. The draft was submitted November 30, 1983 and the revised draft was submitted February 8, 1984. As per our contract, each manual/handbook/workbook is 75 - 100 pages in length. These will be resubmitted as working drafts in June at the end of the field test phase in Phase I.

The primary focus of Phase II has been continual revisions of training materials, in particularly, Resource and How to Workbooks, the field testing of the instructional materials. The field testing of the "Story of California" and the curriculum and instructional materials did encountered some difficulties. Generally, both the transition of students, and their language level(s) makes it difficult to determine/evaluate the students' performance. The concern here is that the sample is too small to adequately determine results.

During this period a great deal of time was spent with bilingual teachers, bilingual resource specialists, and bilingual student teachers, our emphasis here was to determine the effectiveness of the resource and training manuals. Their input was incorporated and revisions were made. We continued to revise the training manual based on the input we received from the various audiences.

June was a month of major activity, finalizing all aspects of the curriculum and instructional materials and completing revisions on the Training, Resource and How to Manuals. Establishing new field test site in Redwood City as well as finalizing data collection in San Francisco and Oakland School districts in order to prepare the field test results report.

The completion of all major deliverables, which included a theoretical justification in the process model, this revision was performed with input from San Francisco's Emergent/Resource Specialist.

Data collection and analysis continued, findings in the Redwood City evaluation did not demonstrate sufficient change, however, relevant findings

were incorporated into the curriculum and recommendations for changes in the evaluation design were incorporated into the evaluation forms.

All major deliverables were revised, completed and sent to Washington. This included the final revisions in the Student Workbook and the Teacher's Guide which accompany the Story of California and writing a Teacher's Edition to the Student Workbook, this included all the worksheets with correct answers filled in (the Teacher's Edition to the Student Workbook represent an example of how we incorporated the input received from the teachers).

It was during this phase that contact was made with the State Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education in which the goals and objectives of both the training materials and instructional materials were presented and explained.

During the fall we arranged for another field test in Oakland and San Francisco. A new dimension was added to this field test, not only did we collect data on the students' oral proficiency, but we also collected data on the students' written language proficiency. The "Written Language Proficiency Rating Scale" was developed by NGA staff in order to rate the students' written proficiency. We collected writing samples from all the students who participated in this final field test.

Other activities during Phase II included training sessions which utilized the training and resource manuals, these workshops were conducted in Berkeley, Redwood City and Oakland, California.

The last two quarters in Phase II involved the completion of several tasks. Firstly, continued field testing of the instructional materials, data collection and analysis, writing the final evaluation report to be submitted. Secondly, scheduling and preparation of training workshops for teachers, resource teachers and bilingual curriculum specialists.

The thrust of Phase II was continual and final revisions of training materials, final evaluation of instructional materials and training workshop for bilingual school district personnel. Because the field testing was such a critical part of our project we have incorporated parts of the final evaluation report.

EVALUATION REPORT

ON FALL, 1984 FIELD TEST

OF

THE STORY OF CALIFORNIA

One of the major products of this project was The Story of California, a middle-school, Spanish-English social studies unit on California geography and history. The unit contains a textbook called The Story of California, written in English on one page and Spanish on the facing page. The Student Workbook contains written exercises on each section of each chapter of the textbook. The Teacher's Guide contains classroom activities for every section of every chapter in the text, as well as scope and sequence guides for the entire unit and introductory material for the teacher.

Field Test

These materials were field tested in two classrooms at Potrero Hill Middle School in the San Francisco Unified School District and five at Lazear Elementary School in the Oakland Unified School District, for a total of seven classrooms in all. The elementary school was used because teachers there felt the students could handle the material. Since some middle schools had not wanted to use the materials because California history is usually taught in 4th grade, it was decided to see how well the materials worked in 4th and 5th grades.

The classes using the materials were:

Oakland	Class A	4th grade	31 students
	Class B	4th grade	29 students
	Class C	5th grade	30 students
	Class D	5th and 6th grade	29 students
	Class E	6th grade	29 students
San Fransisco	Class F	6th, 7th, and 8th grade	23 students
	Class G	7th and 8th grade	33 students
			204 students

The field test was conducted in the Fall, 1984 semester. San Francisco classes began using the materials when school began in September, and the Oakland classes began using the materials in October, 1984. Evaluation data on the materials was collected until the field test was concluded on January 18, 1985, although all classes will continue to use the materials until the end of the school year in June, 1985.

Evaluation Materials

Evaluation data included ratings of students' oral and written proficiency in both Spanish and English, student and teacher feedback about how they liked the materials, and teacher feedback about student performance. During the semester teachers rated student's oral proficiency or the Oral Proficiency Rating Scale (OPRS), on which students are rated from one to five on their pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, and overall communicative skill in Spanish and English; the last dimension is used as the overall rating of oral proficiency (see OPRS in appendix).

The Written Proficiency Rating Scale (WPRS) was devised to rate students' written proficiency in Spanish and English. Modeled after the OPRS, it asks judges to rate students' one paragraph writing samples on a scale of one to four on punctuation, spelling, vocabulary, grammar, and overall effectiveness in communication, with the last dimension being the overall rating of written proficiency (see WPRS in appendix).

Teachers were asked to complete a Teacher Feedback Sheet when they completed each chapter. This sheet asked them to rate how well students learned the language skills, geography skills and key concepts taught in each chapter, the appropriateness and effectiveness of the worksheets and classroom activities, and their perceptions about the textbook. The Student Feedback Sheet asked students how hard the materials were and whether they liked the chapter. (See appendix for Teacher Feedback Sheet and Student Feedback Sheet.)

FIELD TEST RESULTS

One-paragraph writing samples were obtained from most students in all seven classes, and the WPRS was completed for each. Six of the seven teachers completed the OPRS ratings for all students in their classes. For chapter one materials, we received Teacher Feedback Sheets and Student Feedback Sheets from all seven classes. For chapter two we received Student Feedback Sheets and Teacher Feedback Sheets from four classes, although all classes completed chapter two. One teacher submitted a Teacher Feedback Sheet and Student Feedback Sheet for chapters three and four. Only two other classes even got to chapter three during the field test period, since most were

using the materials to supplement other texts rather than as the main text for the unit.

Student Language Proficiency

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the students' oral and written language proficiency, as gauged by the OPRS and WPRS respectively. The entries in these tables represent the number of students in each rating category.

Table 1 shows that students' oral proficiency in English was roughly normally distributed, with most students scoring fairly well (3 or 4 rating) and fewer having very low or very high oral proficiency. In Spanish, however, the distribution is bi-modal; that is, the largest proportions of students are at the high or low end of the scale. This means that students generally can either speak Spanish or not; if they can, they can generally speak it well.

Written proficiency, as indicated in Table 2, shows a different profile. Most students were rated as having very low proficiency in both English (78%) and Spanish (89%). Only a small fraction of students were rated as having high written proficiency in either language.

Chapter 1 Feedback

Chapter 1 is about maps, continents, and the U.S. and California governments. The class time spent on this chapter ranged from 3 to 20 days. The teacher and student feedback on Chapter 1 showed that the reading level in English was appropriate for a majority of students. The teacher feedback sheet showed that it was "about right" for 58% of the students in the field test, "too high" for 22%, and "too low" for 20%. Table 3 shows that 58% of the students felt it was about right or a little easy or hard, while the rest thought it was very easy (35%) or very hard (6%). These figures are generally compatible between the teachers and

Table 1

Summary of Oral Proficiency Rating Scale (OPRS) Scores

Class/Grade	N	Oral Proficiency: Overall Communicative Skill									
		English					Spanish				
		low 1	2	3	4	high 5	low 1	2	3	4	high 5
A/4th	32	0	1	12	7	12	6	0	0	0	26
B/4th	28	3	7	3	12	3	7	9	2	8	2
C/5th	30	0	0	4	17	9	6	4	4	8	8
D/5-6th	29	0	0	11	14	4	15	1	4	8	1
E/6th				No					Response		
F/6-7-8th	23	5	5	9	3	1	0	1	1	2	15 a
G/7-8th	32	3	6	20	3	0	0	2	3	11	6 b
TOTAL	174	11	19	59	56	29	34	17	14	37	58
%	100	6%	11%	34%	32%	17%	20%	10%	8%	21%	33% c

a 4 students speak Tagalog and no Spanish
b 10 students do not speak Spanish; 6 speak Tagalog and 4 Chinese
c 8% do not speak Spanish

Table 2

Summary of Written Proficiency Rating Scale (WPRS) Scores

Class/Grade	English N	Written Proficiency: Overall Effectiveness								
		English				Spanish				
		low 1	2	3	high 4	low 1	2	3	high 4	N
A/4th	30	12	15	2	1	10	6	2	0	18
B/4th	14	3	4	4	3	3	2	1	0	6
C/5th	29	12	12	5	0	8	6	1	0	15
D/5-6th	29	5	20	4	0	4	7	4	0	15
E/6th	21	4	10	6	1	5	6	0	0	11
F/6-7-8th	15	5	6	4	0	0	7	5	1	13
G/7-8th	30	6	17	7	0	2	6	4	1	13
TOTAL	168	47	84	32	5	32	40	17	2	91
%	100	28%	50%	19%	3%	35%	44%	19%	2%	100

Table 3
STUDENT FEEDBACK

Chapter: 1 California - Our State

CLASS/ GRADE	N	#1: English						#2: Spanish						#3: Main Ideas					
		hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A	hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A	hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A
A/4th	28	4	2	3	6	13	-	2	0	1	5	11	9	0	2	8	7	11	-
B/4th	26	2	9	4	6	5	-	9	7	4	0	6	-	1	4	10	8	3	-
C/5th	28	0	0	5	8	14	1	1	1	5	0	5	16	0	1	12	10	4	1
D/5-6th	24	1	1	9	4	9	-	0	2	2	1	4	15	0	2	12	6	4	-
E/6th	26	1	4	3	8	10	-	5	5	6	5	5	-	1	4	7	12	2	-
F/6-7-8th	20	2	8	6	0	4	-	0	2	1	4	7	6	5	3	6	3	3	-
G/7-8th	31	1	0	15	4	10	1	0	3	13	4	11	-	0	7	8	7	8	1
TOTAL	183	11	24	45	36	65	2	17	20	32	19	49	46	7	23	63	53	35	2
%	100	6	13	25	20	35	1	9	11	18	10	27	25	4	13	34	29	19	1

N/A= no answer or not appropriate

Table 3

STUDENT FEEDBACK

Chapter: 1 California - Our State

CLASS/ GRADE	N	#4: Like Chapter?				#5: Stories remind you of you or your family?				#6: Chapter respect people in it?		
		Inter-esting 1	2	3	Boring 4	Yes	A Little	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
A/4th	28	14	5	5	4							
B/4th	26	10	8	5	3							
C/5th	28	8	10	4	6							
D/5-6th	24	5	10	5	4							
E/6th	26	11	13	2	0							
F/6-7-8th	20	10	3	4	3							
G/7-8th	31	17	10	3	1							
TOTAL	183	75	59	28	21							
%	100	41	32	15	12							

N/A = no answer or not appropriate

students, although students tended to rate the materials as easier than the teachers. Given the diversity in grade level and language abilities in these classes, the reading level covers a wide spread of students.

Similar figures occur for the reading level in Spanish. Teachers said the level in Spanish was about right for 60% of the students, too high for 32%, and too low for 8%. Thirty-nine percent of the students said the level was about right, 9% said way too hard, and 27% way too easy; 25% said the question was inappropriate, meaning they could not read Spanish at all. It is also interesting that teachers said they speak in English about 75% of the time, while students speak in English about 80% of the time.

The teachers' ratings of student performance reflect the language diversity found in the classes. The following figures show the percentage of students in each category (rounded to the nearest 5%).

Chapter 1: Average Student Performance

	Extremely Well (85-100%)	Satis-factory (70-84%)	Unsatis-factory (40-69%)	Poor (0-39%)
Spanish Vocabulary	40%	30%	20%	10%
English Vocabulary	65%	20%	12%	3%
Main Concepts	25%	40%	20%	15%
Map Reading Skills	15%	50%	20%	15%
Graph/Chart Reading Skills	12%	50%	20%	15%

These data show that 65%-85% of the students are learning a satisfactory amount with better performance in English language areas than Spanish or

geography areas, where only 65% or 70% performed satisfactorily. There appears to be a problem with learning when 35% of the students are not learning the material at a satisfactory level and 15% showed poor learning. Indeed, Table 3 shows that 10% of the students rated the main ideas as hard (1 or 2 on a scale of 1 to 5).

One key to unsatisfactory performance in geography skills could be the interest of the chapter for the students. Table 3, item 4 shows that 27% of the students rate the chapter on the boring (vs. interesting) side of a 1 - 4 scale. On the Teacher Feedback Sheet, item 14, two teachers said the chapter was boring to students (1 - 3 rating on a scale of 1 - 6), and three more rated it a 4 out of 6, which reflects moderate interest at best. There was a consensus that the sections on the law-makers and the map directions were particularly uninteresting to students. In addition, teachers suggested in item 13 that the graphics were too small and/or too complicated. Thus, chapter 1 needs to be revised to be made more interesting; this, in turn, would help improve student performance by motivating students to learn more.

Another probable reason for the students' poor performance in geography is the fact that few teachers did any of the classroom activities for chapter 1. The number of teachers doing the classroom activities are:

Topic	Did it	Did Not Do it
Globes	3	4
Continents	2	5
Maps-Directions	1	6
Map -Directions	1	6
Distance on a Map	3	4
Continents, Maps	0	7

Those who did do an activity almost always rated it as appropriate in level of difficulty, interesting to themselves and students, and as working well in class. These activities, available in the Teacher's Guide, were designed to reinforce the concepts and skills introduced in text and the worksheets. Thus, by not using the classroom activities, teachers seldom gave students the chance to consolidate whatever they did learn from the text or worksheets.

The student worksheets are another major part of the unit. Feedback on these was generally positive. There were five worksheets with a total of 18 sections. Fourteen of these were rated by a majority of the teachers (and usually all teachers) as being "about right" in difficulty and on the "effective" side of a 1-6 rating scale. The other four sections were rated as "too hard" by a majority of the teachers:

1) Worksheet 2, Section III, on the relationship between a drawing of land and a map of that land;
2) Worksheet 4, Section III, on measuring distance on a map;
3) Worksheet 5, Section I, on making a bar graph;
4) Worksheet 5, Section IV, on taking information from a bar graph and inserting it into a pre-cut pie graph.

The rating of these sections --containing map and graph exercises — as too hard corresponds with the teacher ratings that 35% of the students did not learn map and graph skills at a satisfactory level.

The other items on the Teacher Feedback Sheet covered a variety of miscellaneous issues. There was no consensus about strong and weak points but on suggested changes, two teachers said the book needed a better explanation of the lawmakers and the government and a better explanation

for measuring distances on a map. All teachers said they would use this chapter again with their class.

Four of six respondents liked the language format of English on one page and Spanish on the facing page. They said it gave the students the opportunity to read and learn in the language most comfortable to them. They said most students liked it too, especially Spanish-speakers with very limited English skills, because it gave them the opportunity to learn the English but made them feel secure by also having the corresponding Spanish.

Chapter 2 Feedback

Chapter 2 is about the various land forms in California. We received Teacher Feedback Sheets and Student Feedback Sheets from three classes. One other class submitted only Student Feedback Sheets while another submitted only a Teacher Feedback Sheet.

The variation in time spent on the chapter continued in chapter 2. The four classes reporting spent 6, 4, 20, and 15 days respectively on this chapter. Clearly the coverage in the first two classes (4th and 5 - 6th grades) was minimal, using The Story of California only to supplement other materials. The latter two classes were in middle school and used the materials as the main text.

Teachers and students both spoke in English about 85% of the time. The reading level in Chapter 2 was "about right" for most (about 60%) of the students but "too high" for most of the remainder, whether in English or Spanish.

Student performance figures show that a high percentage of students still are not learning the material well:

Chapter 2: Average Student Performance

	Extremely Well (85 - 100%)	Satis-factory (70 - 84%)	Unsatis-factory (40 - 69%)	Poor (0 - 39%)
Main concepts	15%	50%	30%	5%
Map reading	10	45	30	15
Graph/chart reading	25	35	30	10
Research	30	35	25	10
Spanish vocabulary	15	60	20	5
English vocabulary	25	50	20	5
Spanish grammar	10%	30%	50%	10%

Three factors probably contributed to the poor performance by students. One was that most classes did not spend enough time on the chapter for students to learn the material well. Two of the four teachers reporting only spent four or six days on the chapter; interviews showed that non-reporting teachers spent similar amounts of time on the chapter. This is simply not enough time to learn the material.

A second reason is the relatively low interest the material had for the students, which undoubtedly led to low motivation to learn. All reporting teachers said the materials did not hold great interest for the students, as reflected by ratings of four or less on a scale of 1-6. Thirty four percent of the students rated the materials as boring (see Table 4). Most teachers said that graphics were not particularly interesting to students either.

Table 4

STUDENT FEEDBACK

Chapter: 2 California - The Land

CLASS/ GRADE	N	#1: English						#2: Spanish						#3: Main Ideas					
		hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A	hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A	hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A
A/4th	22	0	2	6	4	10	-	1	3	6	0	8	4	0	1	5	7	9	-
B/4th	27	2	3	9	3	10	-	2	5	6	4	9	1	0	8	7	4	7	1
C/5th*																			
D/5-6th	21	0	0	6	10	5	-	7	0	6	2	4	2	0	3	6	6	6	-
E/6th*																			
F/6-7-8th*																			
G/7-8th	29	2	14	4	8	1		0	3	7	4	8	7	0	5	15	4	5	-
TOTAL	99	4	19	25	25	26	-	10	11	25	10	29	14	0	17	33	21	27	1
%	100	4	19	25	25	26		10	11	25	10	29	14	0	17	33	21	27	1

N/A= no answer or not appropriate

*3 classes did not respond

Table 4

STUDENT FEEDBACK

Chapter: 2 California - The Land

CLASS/ GRADE	N	#4: Like Chapter?				#5: Stories remind you of you or your family?				#6: Chapter respect people in it?		
		Inter-esting 1	2	3	Boring 4	Yes	A Little	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
A/4th	22	10	7	2	3							
B/4th	27	7	7	4	9							
C/5th												
D/5-6th			No response									
E/6th												
F/6-7-8th												
G/7-8th	29	3	17	8	1							
TOTAL	78	20	31	14	13							
%	100	26	40	18	16							

N/A = no answer or not appropriate

A third reason is that as with chapter 1, the teachers did not make sufficient use of the classroom activities and thus did not reinforce what was learned in the text and worksheets. Three of the four reporting teachers did not use any classroom activities from the Teacher's Guide, and the remaining teacher used four of the six activities in this chapter. That teacher had problems with these activities. Two called for the students to work in small groups, but that class was fairly rowdy and the small groups did not work well. The other two activities focused on speaking complete sentences in Spanish; however, the teacher felt the language was inappropriate and found the activities worked well in English.

Chapter 2 contained 6 worksheets with a total of 21 sections on California geography. A majority of teachers rated 15 of the 21 sections as being "about right" in difficulty and "effective" (i.e., 4 or more on a scale of 1 - 6). Three sections were rated by a majority of teachers as "too hard" (Worksheet 9, section I; Worksheet 10, sections I, and II). In all three cases the section was in Spanish and the comments said that "many Spanish speaking students can't read Spanish." This problem is consistent with the data on Students' Spanish language proficiency-- i.e., high or no oral proficiency in Spanish and low written proficiency. However, this problem was not expected when the materials were being designed. On three worksheet sections there was a split judgment. Worksheet II, Section III required students to alphabetize words in Spanish. Two teachers said it was "too hard" because it was in Spanish and two said it was "too easy" because it was in Spanish! The other two sections had a rating of "too hard" by two teachers and "about right" by two teachers. Both sections were

fill-in-the-blank exercises which did not have a selection of answers in a sidebar to choose from; both teachers who felt this exercise was too hard said that it needed to have the answers available.

The final item on the Chapter 2 Teacher Feedback Sheet did not generally elicit a consensus from the teachers. Two of the four teachers did say the chapter was too general and did not provide enough detail on each type of land form (i.e., deserts, mountains, etc.).

Feedback on Chapters 3 and 4

Since only one class submitted a Teacher Feedback Sheet and Student Feedback Sheet for chapter 3 and 4, the detailed analysis presented above for chapters 1 and 2 is unnecessary. It is interesting to note that this class has the oldest students (Class G, 7th and 8th graders). For chapter 3, on The First People in California, the patterns of student performance and teacher and student reaction to the materials are similar to chapters 1 and 2. A little over half the students rated the material as easy but boring (see Table 5). The teacher strongly attacked the chapter on cultural grounds, stating that it oversimplified the Indian culture by making it appear too idyllic and not portraying the activities which men and women did in common and by not explaining that both men and women fished, built houses, made tools, etc.

Of the 18 worksheet sections rated, 10 were rated as about right in difficulty and effective. Three sections — all on alphabetizing — were rated as too easy. Five sections were rated as too hard, four because they were in Spanish and one because it was a fill-in-the-blank exercise without possible answers listed (i.e., same criticism as

Table 5

STUDENT FEEDBACK

Chapter: 3 & 4

CLASS/ GRADE	N	#1: English						#2: Spanish						#3: Main Ideas					
		hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A	hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A	hard 1	2	3	4	easy 5	N/A
						CHAPTER 3: THE FIRST PEOPLE													
G/7-8th	27	0	1	5	7	4	-	2	1	7	7	6	4	0	1	15	4	7	-
						CHAPTER 4: THE EUROPEANS													
G/7-8th	23	1	3	9	7	3	-	2	2	8	3	6	2	0	1	15	6	1	-
TOTAL																			
%	100																		

N/A= no answer or not appropriate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5
STUDENT FEEDBACK

Chapter: 3 and 4

CLASS/ GRADE	N	#4: Like Chapter?				#5: Stories remind you of you or your family?				#6: Chapter respect people in it?		
		Inter-esting 1	2	3	Boring 4	Yes	A Little	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
	C	H	A P	T	E R	3:	T	h e	F i	r s t	P e o	p l e
G/7-8th	27	1	12	13	1	1	1	25	-	20	7*	-
	C	H	A P	T	E R	4:	T	h e	E	u r o	p e	a n s
G/7-8th	23	4	8	6	5	0	2	21	-	18	3*	-
TOTAL												
%	100											

N/A = no answer or not appropriate

* Teacher claims these students did not understand the question; written answers to follow-up questions "who?" and "why?" are inconsistent with intent of question (e.g., "Indian they Killed")

in chapter 2).

Two of five classroom activities were done from chapter 3. One was rated as acceptable in difficulty, as only moderate in interest for the students, and as working only moderately well in class. However, this activity was not done as designed; it included a set of pictures depicting the food chain which groups of students were supposed to put in order. In the class, the pictures were only used as a basis for class discussion. The other activity was an alphabetizing activity in English; the teacher said this activity worked fairly well in class.

Chapter 4 is on the first Europeans in the new world--i.e., Columbus in the new world, Cortez in Mexico, and the first Spanish activities in California. The patterns of student performance were similar to the data on the first three chapters. However, while the teacher felt the text was interesting to the students, 11 of 23 students rated it as boring.

Eleven of the seventeen worksheet sections used were rated as effective and about right in difficulty. The other 6 sections were rated as too hard. Three were in Spanish — two requiring students to write sentences and one to fill in a blank to complete a sentence. Three were in English — two requiring students to write a short answer to a question of fact and one to fill in the blank to complete a sentence. All of these exercises have a common theme; namely, they are exercises to test students' comprehension of the content without referring them to the text or providing choices of answers.

The teacher did do all five chapter 4 activities in the Teacher's Guide. Two activities were in Spanish and required small groups of students to work together. The teacher said that both activities were too hard

because they were in the wrong language for students' abilities; another comment was: "Any activity that involves autonomous small group activity meets with resistance and disorder in my class."

The three English language activities were about right in language difficulty and fairly interesting to the teacher and students. Two were about right in cognitive difficulty and worked reasonably well in class, while the third (a role-playing activity about slavery) was too difficult for the students and thus worked poorly in class; the teacher used it as the basis for class discussion rather than doing role-playing with the students.

Conclusions

The field test data suggest several important conclusions about these materials. Some pertain to the assumptions behind them, some pertain to how to revise the materials, and some pertain to teacher training on the use of the materials.

One of the key assumptions behind these materials was that students' Spanish language abilities are better than their English proficiency, which is limited. However, this appears to be true for oral proficiency only and not for written proficiency. In reading and writing many of these students are as limited or even more limited in Spanish than English (see Tables 1 and 2). This means that written Spanish cannot be counted on to be the basis for written English language development, as originally assumed. Most cannot read complex Spanish and prefer to read or learn in English anyway. Thus, many difficult parts of the written exercise in the Teacher's Guide and Student Worksheets should be translated into English.

A second key finding was that materials could be used by 4th or 5th graders, as well as middle school classes. This is true because the English and Spanish language proficiency of these students from 4th through 8th grade is not significantly different either orally or in writing. There were some activities which were cognitively too hard for 4th graders, but not linguistically too hard. (The reasons why the older children did not have better language proficiency than the younger ones are a complex and separate issue.)

This finding has important implications for the applicability of the materials. California history is typically taught in 4th grade. This unit was designed for middle school students in San Francisco who were newly arrived from Mexico, Central and South America and who could benefit from learning about California history before studying world history later in middle school or in high school. Thus, the unit was designed for an unusual population and was not appropriate for most middle school students because they have already taken California history in 4th grade. The result was that it was difficult to find middle schools that wanted to use the materials, especially outside San Francisco. However, the finding that the materials can be used successfully by 4th graders greatly expands their applicability to the more common setting of a 4th grade California history unit, as well as being useable with recent immigrants to middle schools.

The field test results for chapters 1-4 suggest some revisions needed in the materials themselves, most notably:

1) the text needs to be made more interesting; both teachers and students rated the text as fairly uninteresting and graphics as not very appealing.

2) chapter 3 -- The First People -- should possibly be revised to better reflect the complexity of life among the indigenous people, although these perceptions only came from one teacher;

3) the written Spanish should possibly be downgraded a little in difficulty, because it is now harder in Spanish than English but students' written proficiency is about the same in both languages; however, more consultation with field test teachers and other potential users is needed before such drastic revisions are undertaken;

4) revise the student worksheet sections which are too hard, especially by translating the Spanish sections into English and simplifying the open-ended-question exercises; the sections rated "too easy" should be left intact for the students with very limited language skills;

5) translate some of the Spanish classroom activities,especially the writing activities, into English where they are too hard for the students in Spanish;

6) consider revising some of the small group activities into independent activities, since classes can tend to be too disorderly during small group activities.

The field test results also suggest three ways in which the in-service training of teachers who will use The Story of California can be improved. First, the training should strongly stress the importance of the classroom activities and how to do them. Few field test teachers used very many activities, and this may have been an important factor underlying the unsatisfactory performance of a third or more of the

students, since the activities were designed to reinforce the concepts and skills presented in the other materials.

Second, the teacher training should provide more definite guidelines on how long to spend on the material. It was designed as a semester long unit in which it is the primary text. Using these as supplementary materials and only spending 3 - 4 days on a chapter is not an efficient or effective use of the materials. Classes should probably spend 7 - 10 days per chapter on these materials, assuming that most reading is done outside of class.

Third, the teacher training should focus on getting teachers to use the scope and sequence charts in the Teacher's Guide as part of their lesson planning process. Teachers all say they do not have enough prep time, but few used the scope and sequence charts, which were designed to help in planning. Thus, the training should emphasize how to understand and use these charts, thereby helping to increase teachers' understanding of the goals of the materials, encourage the full use of all the materials, and improve teachers' lesson planning all at the same time.

Appendix

- Oral Proficiency Rating Scale (OPRS)
- Written Proficiency Rating Scale (WPRS)
- Teacher Feedback Sheet (sample for chapter 1)
- Student Feedback Sheet (sample for chapter 1)

RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the objectives listed in our proposal to U. S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs was to compile a list of recommendations which would be helpful to the department. The recommendations are based on the entire project and our experience, as follows:

1) in curriculum development project, teachers need to be released from regular classroom duties in order to attend intensive training sessions specifically designed to enable them to become developers.
2) two writers must be assigned to the curriculum development team.
3) field testing schedule must allow for start-up time, include sufficient time.
4) field test must be in accordance with school year.
5) if training materials are developed, they should be made available to school districts.
6) training bilingual teachers and administrators in order to enable them to function more effectively and efficiently, so often they are overwhelmed by the demands of their job - needs are too great.
7) contractors meeting should be on-site and limited to three times a year.
8) establish technical-team concept at OBEMLA, and last,
9) dissemination of training materials.

NGA

naomi gray associates, inc.

1726 fillmore st. • san francisco 94115 • (415) 922-4633

CONTRACT # 300 82 0322

TO: U.S. Department of Education
AMPS/BEOA Branch
Room 3, 7th and "D" Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

ATTN: Jean Milazzo

FROM: Alicia Mahone, Project Director

DATE: February 8, 1985

Enclosed are three (3) copies of the Minutes of Quarterly Meeting Report as required by Contract # 300 82 0322 for distribution to the appropriate personnel in the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual and Minority Affairs.